



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,230	02/20/2001	Mamiko Kuramochi	1046.1242 (JDH)	4371

21171 7590 10/03/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,230

Applicant(s)

KURAMOCHI, MAMIKO

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

AT

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment filed on July 15, 2005. Claims 1-38 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 1 recites "... first selects any one of the format file and the data file, and secondly drags the other of the format file and the data file to the select file". Because it states "first selects any one of the format file and the data file", so the user can select either the format file or the data file. Then the claim states "secondly drags the other of the format file and the data file to the select file". First of all, it is unclear whether the user drags the format file or drags the data file. Secondly, because the user can select either the format file or the data file in the previous step, it is unclear whether "the selected file" in this step meant the format file or the data file. Therefore, claim 1 is reject under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Independent claims 9 and 16 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-22 and 24-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bence, Jr. et al. ("Bence, Jr.", 6,484,178) in view of Estrada et al. ("Estrada", 6,594,664).

As per claim 1, Bence, Jr. discloses a data processing system comprising:

a display control unit of implementing a display module for displaying at least one format file containing a fixed format, and at least one data file containing item data to be set to the fixed format (Bence, Jr., Fig. 5);

a specifying control unit of implementing a specifying module which firstly selects any one of the format file and the data file, and secondly specifies the other of the format file and the data file to the selected file (Bence, Jr., col. 1, lines 60-66, "examining the submitted client data file; finding a known data format that most closely matches the format of the client data file, known data formats being stored in a format database"); and

a setting unit for setting the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., col. 1, line 60 - col. 2, lines 8, "aligning the data contained in a given record, thus, creating a format corresponding to the client's data format...this function serves to mass convert the client's data records into a common data format").

Bence, Jr. does not explicitly disclose said specifying comprises selecting and dragging any one of the format file and the data file. Estrada teaches specifying comprises selecting and dragging any one of the format file and the data file (Estrada, Fig. 16, element 244, col. 20, lines 46-67, the drag & drop is a specifying operation that specifies the system to convert a data file to a fix format file/HTML file). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the data processing system of Bence, Jr. by incorporating the drag & drop operations as disclosed by Estrada (Estrada, Fig. 16, element 244). The motivation being to allow the user to use drag & drop operations which provides speed, ease of use to the user (Estrada, col. 20, line 57).

As per claim 2, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data to the fixed format of the format file, and creates the plurality of files at one time (Bence, Jr. col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 3, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file by a form overlay function in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr. Fig. 1, 5, 7, col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 4, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose a distinguishing unit of distinguishing between file formats of the specified format file and data file (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 18-33).

As per claim 5, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further disclose distinguishing unit distinguishes between the file formats of the

Art Unit: 2162

format file and the data file on the basis of any one category of element among extensions, file names and a file selection order (Bence, Fig. 4, 6A, 7, col. 7, line 65 - col. 8, line 15).

As per claim 6, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose a print control unit of implementing a print module for printing contents of the item data of the data file which have been set to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., Fig. 4, Printer Maker/Model).

As per claim 7, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said specifying control unit implements the specifying module for specifying the format file and the data file by a drag and drop function (Estrada, Fig. 16, element 244).

As per claim 8, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further disclose said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation of specifying the format file and the data file that are displayed in the form of display objects (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 17-42).

Claims 9-12 and 16-19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-4.

Claims 13-15 and 20-22 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 6-8.

As per claim 24, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format

Art Unit: 2162

of the format file by a form overlay function in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., Fig. 1, 5, 7, col. 2, lines 18-49).

As per claim 25, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach distinguishing unit distinguishing between file formats of the specified format file and data file (Bence, Jr., col. 2, lines 18-49).

As per claim 26, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach a print control unit implementing a print module printing contents of the item data of the data file which have been set to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation (Bence, Jr., col. 6, lines 58-60).

Claims 27, 32 and 37 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

As per claim 28, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said setting unit sets the item data of the data file to the fixed format of the format file in accordance with the specifying operation of specifying the format file and the data file that are displayed in the form of display objects (Bence, Jr., col. 1, line 44 - col. 2, line 49).

Claims 29 and 34 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 24.

Claims 30 and 35 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 25.

Claims 31 and 36 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 26.

Claims 33 and 38 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 28.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bence, Jr. et al. ("Bence, Jr.", 6,484,178) in view of Estrada et al. ("Estrada", 6,594,664) and further in view of Yuichi (JP 9282209).

As per claim 23, Bence, Jr. and Estrada teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the format file and the data file are displayed as a list. Yuichi teaches displaying the files as a list (Yuichi, p13, [Solving Means]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bence, Jr. and Estrada's combined data processing system by displaying the files as a list. The motivation being to display the files as a list which will allow the user to easily locate the file.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on July 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. As per applicant's arguments regarding the reference does not teach firstly selects any one of the format file and the data file, and secondly drags the other of the format file and the data file to the selected file have been considered but are not persuasive. The claim language does not limit which file (format file or data file) the user must select. Therefore, the user can select either the format file or the data file, and drag and drop the other file to the selected file. Estrada teaches dragging and dropping the data file to the format file (Estrada, Fig. 16, element 244, col.

Art Unit: 2162

20, lines 46-67). This reads on the claim language because the claim does not specify the user must drag and drop the format file to the data file. Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4031.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chongshan Chen
September 27, 2005



JEAN M. CORRIZUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER